

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Status

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2 and 15-17 have been rejected. Claims 3-14 and 18-21 have been objected to by the Examiner. Claims 1, 2, 10, 14, 15 and 17 are herein amended. Claim 13 is herein canceled. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

Claim Objections

Claim 10 has been objected to because the term “the upper addresses” lacks antecedent basis. Claim 10 has been amended to correct the above-mentioned informality. Reconsideration of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant’s regard as the invention. In particular, claims 1 and 16 have been rejected because the Examiner is unsure of the difference between the “memory block” and the “data memory block” recited therein.

Applicants direct the Examiner to FIG. 2, which illustrates an integrated circuit (IC) including, inter alia, memory blocks (e.g., MB1-MB4) and corresponding data memory blocks (e.g., DMB1-DMB4). As can be gleaned, the memory blocks and the data memory blocks are separate components of the IC. In addition, each of the memory blocks includes a plurality of sub-memory blocks (e.g., SMB1-SMBM), whereas each of

the data memory blocks does not. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2 and 15-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 20040085817 (Kim).

Applicants respectfully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 3-14 and 18-21 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants have incorporated essentially all the features of claim 13 into independent claims 1 and 15 to place independent claims 1 and 15 and the claims which depend therefrom in condition for allowance.


Dependent Claims

Applicants have not independently addressed the rejections of the dependent claims because Applicants submit that, in view of the amendments to the claims presented herein and, for at least similar reasons as why the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend are believed allowable as discussed, supra, the dependent claims are also allowable. Applicants however, reserve the right to address any individual rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary or appropriate.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claims as herein presented are allowable over the prior art of record, taken alone or in combination, and that the respective rejections be withdrawn. Applicants further submit that the application is hereby placed in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Richard D. Ratchford Jr.
Reg. No. 53,865
Attorney for Applicant(s)

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Rd.
Woodbury, NY 11797
Tel: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889